



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,758	07/15/2003	Christopher Vienneau	G&C 30566.335-US-01	7388
55895	7590	04/30/2008	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,758	VIENNEAU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 01/14/2008. This action is made **Final**.
 - B. Claims 1-32 remain pending.
 - C. Certified Copy of Foreign Priority Application was received 01/29/2008.
 - D. Drawing objection is withdrawn.
 - E. Specification objection is withdrawn due to amendment.
-

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438,

164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of Application No. 10/818,530, herein after "530" and claims 1-33 of Application No. 10/403,062, herein after "062". Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is a narrower version of the limitations in ('530) and ('062).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action: A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Trinh et al. (US Pub 2002/0051005), hereinafter "Trinh".

As to independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 31 (e.g. apparatus, method, system, computer-readable medium, etc), Trinh teaches apparatus for processing image data (par [0009]) comprising processing means (Abstract, lines 1-3; fig. 1, label 103; par [0027], lines 1-5), input means (fig. 1, labels 105, 106: par [0027], lines 9-15) and display means (fig. 1, label 104; par [0027], line 11), wherein said image data is defined by a plurality of data processing nodes arranged in a hierarchical structure and said processing means is configured to perform the steps of (Abstract): generating a first image frame (fig. 5, label 503; par [0037]) comprising a plurality of components (fig. 7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3) by means of processing said plurality of data processing nodes (fig. 8, labels 805-808, 810; par [0049]-[0050]; outputting said first image frame to said display means (fig. 1, label 104; par [0027], line 11; fig. 8, label 827; par [0050], lines 21-22); receiving, via said input means (fig. 1, labels 105, 106: par [0027], lines 9-15), first user input data indicating one of said plurality of components (fig. 7, label 711);

in response to said receiving, automatically selecting a first data processing node considered to be appropriate to said indicated component (par [0056] fig. 7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3) displaying editing tools relevant to said first data processing node (par [0056], lines 6-8; figure 7; par.46); and outputting said second image frame to said display means (fig. 1, label 104; par [0027], line 11; fig. 8, label 827; par [0050], lines 21-22).

Trinh teaches computer-readable medium comprising a computer program storage device (fig. 2, label 212) storing instructions that when read and executed by a computer, results in the computer performing a method for processing image data (par [0031]).

As to dependent claims 2 and 15, Trinh further teaches the first data processing node is in a sub-structure of said hierarchical structure that defines said component (par [0040], the process node in figure 6, label 608 is a sub-structure).

As to dependent claims 3 and 16, Trinh further teaches the sub-structure is a layer (fig. 6, label 613), wherein a layer is defined as a connected collection of nodes having at the top a node that has the same parent node as at least one other node (fig. 6, label 613; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node).

As to dependent claims 4 and 17, Trinh further teaches processing means selects said first data processing node by performing the following steps (fig. 9, step 903; par [0053]): identifying one of the plurality of data processing nodes that defines said

component (par [0046]); defining a plurality of layers within said hierarchical structure by identifying nodes with a plurality of children nodes (fig. 6; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node); identifying the layer that includes said identified data processing node (fig. 6, label 613; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node); and selecting the top node of said identified layer (par [0050]).

As to dependent claims 5, 18 and 32, Trinh further teaches the processing means selects said first data processing node by performing the following steps (fig. 9, step 903; par [0053]): identifying one of the plurality of data processing nodes that defines said component (par [0046]); defining a plurality of layers within said hierarchical structure by identifying nodes with a plurality of children nodes (fig. 6; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node); identifying the layer that includes said identified data processing node (fig. 6, label 613; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node); and selecting a bottom node of said identified layer (fig. 7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames; par [0049]; fig. 8, label 806).

As to dependent claims 6 and 19, Trinh further teaches the processing means selects said first data processing node by performing the following steps (fig. 9, step 903; par [0053]): identifying one of the plurality of data processing nodes that defines said component (par [0046]); selecting the closest node above said identified node that has

the same parent node as at least one other node (fig. 7, label 715; par [0046], lines 15-17).

As to dependent claims 7 and 20, Trinh further teaches in response to first further user input data said processing means performs the following steps (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames which represent nodes): selecting a portion of said hierarchical structure that is considered appropriate to said selected component and contains said first data processing node (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames which represent nodes; par [0056]); generating third image data comprising a depiction of said portion (fig. 5, label 508); and outputting said third image data to said display means (fig. 7, label 707; par [0045], lines 10-12).

As to dependent claims 8 and 21, Trinh further teaches the third image data (fig. 5, label 508) further includes a display of parameters relating to said first data processing node (fig. 8, labels 803, 807. 810; par [0049]; par [0032], lines 15-19).

As to dependent claims 9 and 22, Trinh further teaches the said portion of said hierarchical structure is a layer (fig. 6, label 613), wherein a layer is defined as a connected collection of nodes having at the top a node that has the same parent node as at least one other node (fig. 6, label 613; par [0041], that label 613 is a parent node).

As to dependent claims 10, 23 and 29, Trinh further teaches in response to second further user input data indicating navigation through said hierarchical structure said

processing means performs the following steps (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames which represent nodes): selecting a second data processing node (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames; par [0049]; fig. 8, label 806); generating a fourth image frame (fig. 5, label 514, finished clip) comprising said plurality of components and tools relevant to said second data processing node (fig. 8, label 806; par [0037]); and outputting said fourth image frame to said display means (fig. 5, label 514; par [0037]; fig. 7, label 707; par [0045], lines 10-12).

As to dependent claims 11 and 24, Trinh further teaches the second data processing node (fig. 8, label 808) is connected in said hierarchical structure to said first data processing node (fig. 8, label 812) if said further user input data indicates vertical navigation (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames; par [0049]).

As to dependent claims 12 and 25, Trinh further teaches the second data processing node (fig. 8, label 806) has the same parent node (fig. 8, label 809) as said first data processing node (fig 8, label 805) if said further user input data indicates horizontal navigation (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], lines 1-3, the user can select frames; par [0049]).

As to dependent claims 13 and 26, Trinh further teaches the second data processing node (fig. 8, label 806) is of a comparable data type to said first data processing node. (fig 8, label 805) but defines a different one of said plurality of components from said

indicated component if said further user input data indicates horizontal navigation (fig.7, label 711; par [0046], the user can select frames and has multiple components; par [0049]).

As to independent claim 30, The rejection is as the same as the rejection of independent claims 11, 12 and 13 above.

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

Note: Examiner makes note the use of the term "component" judging from the current rendering of the independent claims it is not fully clear of the definition of a "component", Examiner suggest an amendment to the independent claims for purposes of better defining what a component is exactly instead of a broad generic definition to what is known in the art that can be applied to the current claim language.

A1. Applicant argues that Trinh does not teach selecting a data processing node considered to be appropriate to indicated component and performing the selecting of a node in response to a user indicating a specific component of an image frame.

R1. Examiner does not agree, Trinh as discussed in paragraph 46 Trinh explains how selection of a component determines what nodes are selected, thus when the user uses input means to select a component a node is automatically selected and judging by which component is selected the appropriate node is selected (fig.7 and 705-706,711-712), therefore Trinh does teach selecting a data processing node considered to be appropriate to indicated component and performing the selecting of a node in response to a user indicating a specific component of an image frame.

A2. Applicant argues Trinh does not display editing tools relevant to an identified node.

R2. Examiner does not agree, again in par.46 Trinh explains that editing tools related to the nodes are display on the monitor for user interaction (fig.7, 713, 714, 715).

A3. Applicant does not agree with Double Patent rejection.

R3. Examiner maintains the rejection as this immediate application current claim language is broader than applications 10/818,530 and 10/403,062. Please note above for more details on Double Patenting.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
AU: 2179
April 22, 2008

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179